

Princes and prophets: democracy and the defamation of power Herrenberg, T.

Citation

Herrenberg, T. (2022, June 1). *Princes and prophets: democracy and the defamation of power*. Retrieved from https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3304748

Version: Publisher's Version

License: License agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the

Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden

Downloaded from: https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3304748

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Propositions relating to the dissertation Princes and Prophets:

Democracy and the Defamation of Power by Tom Herrenberg

- The continuing expansion of human rights erodes the legitimacy of human rights as it obfuscates
 the distinction between politics and human rights
- 2. 'Free speech absolutism' is, in a legal sense, a meaningless concept
- 3. The election of countries with abysmal human rights records to bodies designed to protect and promote human rights harms human rights
- 4. Using historical atrocities, such as the Second World War or the Rwandan Civil War, as arguments to justify limits to free expression in the public discourse of contemporary liberal democracies is unconvincing
- 5. Punishing opinions on the basis of a broadly drafted 'incitement' clause, where no harm is likely to occur as a result of the utterance, gives governments a pretext to ban uncomfortable opinions
- 6. One cannot convey the same message by just using other words
- 7. The European Court of Human Rights should reconsider its approach to the regulation of blasphemy
- 8. Universities should not support 'no-platforming'
- 9. In the public discourse of stable democracies, the ability to speak one's truth should trump the sensibilities of any group of the population
- 10. Given that public discourse has shifted to a high degree from offline to online, large social media companies can no longer be regarded as merely private companies, since they have become democratically relevant